



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/308,300 | 07/14/1999 | EDWARD S. MANN II | | 5978 |

7590 03/02/2006

David B Weaver
Vinson & Elkins LLP
2300 First City Tower
1001 Fannin Street
Houston, TX 77002-6760

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

HARRIS, CHANDA L

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3715

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/308,300 | | MANN II ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Chanda L. Harris | | 3715 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-41 and 43-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 38 and 42-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 39-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/28/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

In response to the remarks filed on 12/27/04, Claims 38-41 and 43-62 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 38 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Ramshaw et al. (US 5,791,907).

1. [Claims 38, 61-62]: Regarding Claims 38 and 61-62, Chiang discloses a user interface (i.e. a menu) that transmits an instruction set having a plurality of instructions (i.e. input actions) for selection by a user and receives at least one selected instruction based upon the instruction set, said at least one instruction designating a target application (i.e. step panel) from a plurality of independently-executable computer applications (i.e. step panels). See Col.3: 27-39. Chiang discloses wherein the user interface further comprises a topic selection interface. See Col.3: 27-29 and FIG.2, element 62. Chiang discloses a data retrieval interface (i.e. monitoring system) that retrieves a plurality of data from a computer memory (e.g. the lesson control file), said plurality of data based upon at least one instruction. See Col.3: 53-57. Chiang

discloses wherein a portion of said data comprises video data (via video display) and a data interpreter that receives said data and said at least one selected instruction, said data interpreter translates said data into a plurality of actions with respect to said target application data and said data. See Col.6: 64-66 and Abstract. Chiang discloses a target application interface (i.e. step panel) that receives at least some of said plurality of actions (i.e. input actions) and that selectively issues some of said plurality of actions for externally operating the target application (i.e. controlling the product to be learned) and that relays feedback from the target application back through the data interpreter to the user interface. See Col.3: 35-39, 46-65.

Regarding Claims 38, 61, and 62, Applicant arguments pertaining to Chiang's disclosure of a peripheral device are considered moot since Applicant has no claim limitations in these claims directed to such.

Chiang does not disclose expressly wherein the topic selection interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the user interface. However, Ramshaw teaches such in Col.9: 22-24: The Main Menu option 62 returns a user to the display shown in FIGS. 3A and 3B, from wherever the program presently is at that time. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate wherein the topic selection interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the user interface into the method and system of Chiang, in light of the teaching of Ramshaw, in order to permit a user to control the operation of the software substantially from an input device such as a mouse, rather than having to input from the keyboard.

Claims 38 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Daniels et al. (US 5,310,349).

2. [Claims 38, 61-62]: Regarding Claims 38 and 61-62, Chiang discloses a user interface (i.e. a menu) that transmits an instruction set having a plurality of instructions (i.e. input actions) for selection by a user and receives at least one selected instruction based upon the instruction set, said at least one instruction designating a target application (i.e. step panel) from a plurality of independently-executable computer applications (i.e. step panels). See Col.3: 27-39. Chiang discloses wherein the user interface further comprises a topic selection interface. See Col.3: 27-29 and FIG.2, element 62. Chiang discloses a data retrieval interface (i.e. monitoring system) that retrieves a plurality of data from a computer memory (e.g. the lesson control file), said plurality of data based upon at least one instruction. See Col.3: 53-57. Chiang discloses wherein a portion of said data comprises video data (via video display) and a data interpreter that receives said data and said at least one selected instruction, said data interpreter translates said data into a plurality of actions with respect to said target application data and said data. See Col.6: 64-66 and Abstract. Chiang discloses a target application interface (i.e. step panel) that receives at least some of said plurality of actions (i.e. input actions) and that selectively issues some of said plurality of actions for externally operating the target application (i.e. controlling the product to be learned) and that relays feedback from the target application back through the data interpreter to the user interface. See Col.3: 35-39, 46-65.

Regarding Claims 38, 61, and 62, Applicant arguments pertaining to Chiang's

disclosure of a peripheral device are considered moot since Applicant has no claim limitations in these claims directed to such.

Chiang does not disclose expressly wherein the topic selection interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the user interface. However, Daniel teaches such in Col.7: 39-41, for example: If the toolbox 56 is selected, a list of student productivity tools is presented from which the student user may choose a desired tool. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate wherein the topic selection interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the user interface into the method and system of Chiang, in light of the teaching of Daniels, in order to provide access to learning functions.

Claims 43-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Rowe (US 5,228,859).

1. [Claims 43,47-49,51, 55-57]: Regarding Claims 43,47-49,51, and 55-57, Chiang does not disclose expressly wherein the data retrieval interface comprises a network interface for accessing said plurality of data from a device coupled to a network, wherein the network interface comprises a local area network interface, an Internet interface, and a wireless interface. Moreover, Chiang does not disclose expressly a target peripheral device. However, Rowe teaches a network interface (i.e., computer network) in Col.14: 1-3 and a target peripheral device (i.e., tape) in Col.7: 15-33. At the time of the invention, local area network interfaces and internet interfaces would have been acknowledged as being old and well known in the art and it is obvious that a

computer network could include a local area network or an internet. Moreover, wireless interfaces for accessing a plurality of data from a device coupled to a network are old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Chiang, in light of the teaching of Rowe, in order to provide an alternate mechanism for data transmission.

2. [Claims 44,52]: Regarding Claims 44 and 52, Chiang discloses wherein the user interface further comprises a control bar, and wherein the user interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the control bar. See FIG.3, element 72.

3. [Claims 45,53]: Regarding Claims 45 and 53, Chiang discloses wherein the user interface further comprises a topic selection interface, and wherein the topic selection interface is displayed only when commands are executed via the user interface. See Col.3: 27-29 and FIG.2, element 62.

4. [Claims 46,54]: Regarding Claims 46 and 54, Chiang discloses wherein the data comprises video data (via video display). See Col.6: 64-66 and Abstract.

5. [Claim 50]: Regarding Claim 50, Chiang discloses wherein the target application interface selectively takes control of the target application based upon user input. See Col.3: 53-57.

Claims 58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang/Rowe as applied to claims 43 and 51 above, and further in view of Durham et al. (US 5,832,502).

[Claims 58, 60]: Regarding Claims 58 and 60, Chiang discloses a header block further comprising a type of instruction parameter (i.e. lookup tables). See Col.3: 57-60.

Chiang/Rowe does not disclose expressly wherein said data includes a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter. However, Durham teaches a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter (i.e., a unique header block comprising a time stamp parameter) in Claim 1. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the method and system of Chiang/Rowe, in light of the teaching of Durham, in order to indicate the time a particular type of data record was created.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang/Ramshaw as applied to Claim 38 above, and further in view of Durham et al. (US 5,832,502).

[Claim 59]: Regarding Claim 59, Chiang discloses a header block further comprising a type of instruction parameter (i.e. lookup tables). See Col.3: 57-60. Chiang/Ramshaw does not disclose expressly wherein said data includes a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter. However, Durham teaches a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter (i.e., a unique header block comprising a time stamp parameter) in Claim 1. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the method and system of Chiang/Ramshaw, in light of the teaching of Durham, in order to indicate the time a particular type of data record was created.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang/Daniels as applied to Claim 38 above, and further in view of Durham et al. (US 5,832,502).

[Claim 59]: Regarding Claim 59, Chiang discloses a header block further comprising a type of instruction parameter (i.e. lookup tables). See Col.3: 57-60. Chiang/Daniels does not disclose expressly wherein said data includes a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter. However, Durham teaches a header block further comprising a time stamp parameter (i.e., a unique header block comprising a time stamp parameter) in Claim 1. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation into the method and system of Chiang/Daniels, in light of the teaching of Durham, in order to indicate the time a particular type of data record was created.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 39-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See rejection above. This action has been made NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-4448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica S. Carter can be reached on 571-272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Chanda L. Harris
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3715